Remarks

Claim 1 recites "registering, in response to an instruction included in source code for an upstream component, a procedure at a downstream component in a packet processing pipeline." In rejecting claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Office Action states that Kataria (U.S. 7,177,279) teaches registering a procedure, in response to an instruction included in source code for an upstream component. Attorney for Applicant disagrees that Kataria teaches the recited limitations.

Attorney for Applicant believes the Office Action has mischaracterized Kataria. In particular, the Office Action seemingly takes the position that the cells received by buffers include threshold values for the buffers. However, in Kataria, a threshold processor 208 calculates and provides threshold values for buffers 202(1)-202(4) based on traffic statistics. That is, the threshold processor 208 determines threshold values, they are not included in the cells. Thus, since the rejection, as understood by Attorney for Applicant, relies on threshold levels being included in cells, Kataria does not teach "registering a procedure, in response to an instruction included in source code for an upstream component".

Additionally, the Office Action states that the motivation to use the teachings of Kataria was that "threshold level can be set based on transmitting device". Again, however, Attorney for Applicant disagrees that the cells of Kataria include threshold values. The threshold level is set based on statistics of the threshold processor 208, not included in cells sent by the transmitting device. Thus, Attorney for Applicant asserts that the Office Action has not provided a motivation for one of skill in the art to combine the Kataria and Kuo references.

For at least the reasons above, Attorney for Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims. Claim 15 includes similar, though not identical limitations, and for at least reasons similar to those above respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 and its corresponding dependent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/17/08 /Robert A. Greenberg/

Robert A. Greenberg
Attorney for Intel®
Reg. No. 44,133